

## REMARKS

The following remarks are respectfully submitted in response to the Office Action dated September 27, 2007.

Claims 1-16 remain pending in the present application. In addition, new claims 17 – 54 are hereby presented for examination. Claims 1-7, 15 and 16 have been rejected under Section 102 as allegedly being anticipated by USP No. 5,101,437 to Plamondon (“Plamondon”). Claims 8-11 have been rejected under Section 103 as allegedly being obvious over Plamondon in view of USP No. 4,805,222 to Young et al. (“Young”). Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under Section 103 as allegedly being obvious over Plamondon in view of USP No. 5,042,073 to Collot et al. (“Collot”).

By the amendments above and the remarks provided herein, the Applicants traverse the rejections of claim 1-16 and respectfully request further examination of the application.

### Examiner Interview

Applicants’ undersigned attorney would like to thank Examiner Park for participating in a telephonic interview on December 11, 2007. During the interview, applicants’ attorney summarized the claimed invention and how it is distinguished over the references cited in the Office Action dated September 27, 2007. The Applicants would also like to thank the Examiner for the opportunity to add claims 17-54, which are directed to methods that are analogous to currently pending claims 1-16. The above amendments and following remarks reflect the discussions held during the interview.

### Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended, without disclaimer or prejudice, to more particularly point out the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added to the application. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the Specification in the section entitled, “Authentication” beginning on page 4, for example.

Claims 10 and 15 have been amended, without disclaimer or prejudice, to clarify the language of the claims.

Claims 17-54 have been added, support of which may be found throughout the Specification.

Independent claim 1 § 102 Rejection

Claim 1 stands rejected under § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Plamondon. The Applicants have amended claim 1 as follows:

[[ (a) ]] a first extraction means for extracting angle and distance data relating to different parts of the user's signature inputted into the system by the manual input device to obtain a signature trace;

normalization means for normalizing the signature trace based upon a time to obtain a normalized signature trace;

a second extraction means for extracting angle and distance data relating to different parts of the normalized signature trace;

[[ (b) ]] registration means for setting up a reference data file compiled from angle and distance data relating to a plurality of samples of the user's signature inputted into the system by the user by means of the manual input device during a registration phase, wherein the plurality of samples of the user's signature are normalized based upon a time to obtain a plurality of normalized samples.

Applicants assert that Plamondon fails to anticipate claim 1. More particularly, as discussed in the telephonic interview, Plamondon discloses sampling a signature during acquisition at predetermined intervals to obtain position signals according to the X and Y coordinates of a Cartesian reference system. (Plamondon: col. 1, lines 44-54). The coordinates are processed and graphed. (Plamondon: Summary of the Invention). Plamondon's disclosure is limited to apparatus and systems in which the timing of the signature can be determined consistently from user to user or system to system, e.g. the input tablet of Plamondon.

By distinction, the present application discloses a system in which the angular and distance data are extracted to generate a signature trace, and the extracted information is then normalized and angular and distance data is extracted from the normalized trace.

The Applicants respectfully assert that Plamondon fails to teach the recitations of claim 1, and therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

**Dependent Claims 2-16 Rejections under § 102 and § 103**

By reason of their dependence upon claim 1, the rejection to which has been traversed, the Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2-16 are also allowable. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to claims 2-16 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**DOCKET NO.:** \*\*03-0005/0595USAP135730  
**Application No.:** 10/500,854  
**Office Action Dated:** September 27, 2007

**PATENT**

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 27, 2008

/Robert A. Madayag/  
Robert A. Madayag  
Registration No. 57,355

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439